



JFW

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Matt Luby  
**From:** Thomas Dom  
**Date:** 2/6/2005  
**Re:** Application No. 10/692,102

---

## **REMARKS**

I will address the actions, objections, and rejections in your Office Action Summary dated December 10, 2004 in the order presented.

### **Drawings**

**Page 2**  
I have supplied corrected drawing sheets for Figures 1 and 2 as requested.

### **Specification**

**Page 3, paragraph 2**  
I have removed the reference to the publication "Motorcycle Chassis Design". I have submitted both a marked up version and a clear version due to the extensive changes.

### **Claim Objections**

**Page 3, paragraph 3**  
I have corrected the informalities using strikethroughs for deletions and underlining for insertions.

### **Claim Rejections**

**Page 4, Paragraph 5**  
I have replaced the term "steering lock" with the term "turning angle" in the applicable claims and inserted a discussion of the turning angle in the specification.

**Page 4, paragraph 8**  
Claim 1 was revised by replacing the words second and first with the words forward and rear, respectively.

**Page 4, paragraph 9**  
I have specified a range of lengths in claim 1 that is supported by the discussion of turning angle that was added to the specification.

Page 5, paragraph 11

The following differences between my application and the prior art (Edele, US Pat. No. 1,743,121) are as follows

- 1) The links 41, lateral arms 44, and arms 38a in Edele are for steering control only, they do not support any of the vehicle weight. These items perform the same function as the control rod 15, the steering lever 13, and the steering arm 17 respectively in Figure 1 of my application. Note that items 41, 44, and 38a in Edele are shown on both sides of the wheel but this is redundant. Since they are rigid they would perform the same function if only one set on one side of the wheel was used as I have done.
- 2) In Edele, all of the vehicle weight on the front wheel is absorbed through member 17 and transmitted to the vehicle frame by cross piece 15 and 15a. There are no such similar items in my application.
- 3) In my application all of the vehicle weight on the front wheel is absorbed through the side rails 2 and 3 (Figure 1). There are no such similar items in Edele.
- 4) The axis of rod 36 in Edele does not allow the wheel 16 to move vertically in an arc as does the rear rail pivot pin E in my application (Figure 1). Edele does not show any suspension system that allows for the movement of the front wheel in response to road irregularities. The rod 36 is in a vertical plane, while the rear rail pivot pin E (Figure 1 of my application) is in a horizontal plane. I have amended claim 1 to clarify that the pivot pin E lies in a horizontal plane.
- 5) The wheel 17 in Edele pivots about the spindle 18 during a turn and the wheel contact point remains aligned with the spindle thru any degree of turning. My application does not have any similar spindle and the wheel contact point varies according the angle of the turn and variations of the design elements.

Because of these differences I do not feel that claim 1 of my application is anticipated by Edele.

Sincerely,

